arXiv:cond-mat/9607016v1 3 Jul 1996

Point interaction in dimension two and three as models of small scatterers

P. Exner and P. Šeba

Nuclear Physics Institute, Academy of Sciences
CZ–25068 Řež near Prague, and
Doppler Institute, Czech Technical University,
Břehová 7, CZ–11519 Prague, Czech Republic

In addition to the conventional renormalized–coupling–constant picture, point interactions in dimension two and three are shown to model within a suitable energy range scattering on localized potentials, both attractive and repulsive.

Point interactions described by formal δ–shaped potentials were used in quantum mechanics from the early thirties. It lasted several decades, however, until a proper way to handle the corresponding Schrödinger operators was found. Following the observation of Berezin and Faddeev [4], the problem was studied systematically in the eighties. The results are summarized in the monograph [1], references to some recent work are given, *e.g.*, in [2, 8]. In its present form the point–interaction method represents a versatile tool for constructing solvable models whose power has not been yet, to our opinion, appreciated fully in the physical community.

Within the standard quantum mechanical formalism point interactions can be constructed as long as the configuration space dimension does not exceed three, and they can be interpreted as limits of suitable families of squeezed potentials. In the one–dimensional case the limiting argument admits a straightforward interpretation, because the point–interaction coupling constant is just the integral of the approximating potential: a slow particle on the line with a well–spread wavefunction "sees" only the average value of a localized potential.

In distinction to that the approximation by scaled potentials in dimension two and three requires existence of a zero–energy resonance and a particular coupling–constant renormalization; a detailed discussion of the related mathematical problems can be found in [1, 9]. This gives these point interactions a flavour of something exceptional, for instance, one is led to believe that they cannot be used to model well–localized *repulsive* potentials. That would have consequences, in particular, for recent studies of quantum wires with natural or artificial impurities [5, 6, 8, 10, 12].

To be more specific, recall that the Hamiltonian with N point interactions is formally given by

$$H \;=\; -\,\Delta \,+\, \sum_{i=1}^{N} \alpha_i \delta(\vec{x}-\vec{x}_i)\,, \tag{1}$$

where Δ denotes the Laplace operator of appropriate dimension and α_i, $\vec{x}_i$ are the coupling constants and the localization of the point interactions, respectively. If a particular α_i in the above expression is positive, the corresponding point interaction is interpreted as "repulsive" and vice versa — see, *e.g.*, [5, 6].

Our aim here is to show, that such an understanding of (1) is misleading, at least if we want to identify the formal coupling constants α_i with the parameters in the boundary conditions which define the point interactions rigorously [1]. In fact —- as we are going to demonstrate by approximating the point interactions by a suitable well localized potential — only the negative coupling constants α_i can be *typically* given a straightforward physical interpretation, and moreover, it is not appropriate to associate $\alpha_i < 0$ with an attractive interaction, since the corresponding scattering matrix describes at low energies both attractive as well as repulsive potentials.

Let us stress that we speak about approximation by a fixed potential. If we start squeezing it we arrive at the free Hamiltonian unless a special choice of the potential and the coupling–constant renormalization is made [1]. Nevertheless, we shall see that a point interaction represents a natural model for the scattering behaviour of a well localized potential within a certain energy interval.

In what follows we focus on one point interaction only. Due to the zero radius of the potential the only nontrivial contribution to the on–shell S–matrix is given by its s–wave component $S_0 = e^{2i\delta_0}$ with the phase shift δ_0 given by the formulae [1, Secs. I.1, I.5]

$$\delta_0(k) \;=\; \begin{cases} \arctan\left(\frac{\pi}{2(2\pi\alpha+\gamma+ln\frac{k}{2})}\right) & \text{in dimension 2} \\ \\ \arctan\left(\frac{k}{4\pi\alpha}\right) & \text{in dimension 3} \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

where k^2 is the energy of the scattered particle and $\gamma = 0.577..$ is the Euler's constant.

Let us start with the two–dimensional case. A particular case of the problem we address here has been recently discussed in connection with semiclassical resonances in scattering on a system of hard planar discs [13]. The authors of this paper derive the s–wave scattering amplitude for a disc of radius a to be

$$d \;\approx\; \frac{2\pi}{\ln\left(\frac{2}{ka}\right) - \gamma + \frac{\pi i}{2}} \tag{3}$$

for $ka \ll 1$. A comparison with (2) shows that we will obtain the same phase shift if we put the corresponding "coupling constant" equal to

$$\alpha \;=\; \frac{1}{2\pi}\,\ln a\;. \tag{4}$$

To illustrate that this is true not only for hard discs but also for well–distinguished potential barriers and *nonresonant* wells, we shall discuss below the low–energy scattering on a compactly supported potential; to avoid technicalities we shall consider just the example of a rectangular barrier/well.

Consider therefore a potential in $I\!\!R^2$ which equals V_0 within a circular disc of diameter a and zero otherwise. Due to the rotational symmetry, the scattering may be considered in each partial wave separately. The corresponding solutions to the radial Schrödinger equation of energy k^2 are well known,

$$f(r) \,=\, \begin{cases} c\,\sqrt{r}\,J_\ell(\kappa r) & \dots \qquad |r|<a \\ \\ \sqrt{r}\,\left[\,J_\ell(kr)+ie^{i\delta_\ell}\sin\delta_\ell\,H_\ell^{(1)}(kr)\right] & \dots \qquad |r|>a \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

where $\kappa := \sqrt{k^2-V_0}$.

In the hard–disc case, $V_0 = \infty$, the inner solution is absent, $c = 0$, and the condition $f(a) = 0$ yields easily

$$\delta_\ell(k) \,=\, \arctan\,\frac{J_\ell(ka)}{Y_\ell(ka)}\,. \tag{6}$$

At high energies, these phase shifts behave as $-ka+\frac{\pi}{2}(2\ell-1)$. On the other hand, for $ka \ll 1$ we have

$$\delta_\ell(k) \,\approx\, -\,\arctan\,\frac{1}{\pi}\left(\frac{2}{ka}\right)^{2\ell}$$

if $\ell \neq 0$, which tends to the "free" value $\frac{\pi}{2}\,(\mathrm{mod}\,\pi)$ as $a \to 0$, while the s–channel asymptotics is

$$\delta_0(k) \,\approx\, \arctan\,\frac{\pi}{2\left(\gamma+\ln\frac{ka}{2}\right)} \tag{7}$$

up to $\mathcal{O}\left((ka)^{-2}\right)$. Since the point–interaction is given by expression (2) with the denominator $2\left(2\pi\alpha+\gamma+\ln\frac{k}{2}\right)$, we arrive again at the identification (4).

For a finite barrier/well, $|V_0| < \infty$, the requirement of smooth matching of the inner and outer solution in (5) leads to

$$\delta_\ell(k) \,=\, \frac{\pi}{2} \,-\, \arg\left\{\left[\,k\,J_\ell(\kappa a)H_\ell^{(1)\prime}(ka) - \kappa\,J_\ell'(\kappa a)H_\ell^{(1)}(ka)\right]\left(\frac{\kappa}{|\kappa|}\right)^{\ell}\right\}\,. \tag{8}$$

We are interested in the behaviour of this function for $|\kappa|a \gg 1 \gg ka$. The square bracket is then mostly dominated by the second term. An exception may occur in the well case ($V_0 < 0$) when κ is real and the first–kind Bessel function has an oscillatory asymptotics. The second–term dominance is then violated in the vicinity of the points where $\kappa a \approx \frac{\pi}{4}\,(4n+2\ell+1)$, *i.e.*, resonances of the corresponding scattering process.

Away of the resonances, the dominating role of the second term is checked by estimating the ratio

$$\frac{k\,H_\ell^{(1)\prime}(ka)}{\kappa\,H_\ell^{(1)}(ka)} \,=\, \frac{\ell}{\kappa a} \,-\, \frac{k\,H_{\ell+1}^{(1)}(ka)}{\kappa\,H_\ell^{(1)}(ka)}\,.$$

If $\ell \neq 0$ and $ka \ll 1$, the *rhs* behaves as $\ell/2\kappa a$, while for $\ell = 0$ we have instead $-(\kappa a \ln ka)^{-1}$; both are $\ll 1$ under our assumption. Furthermore, $\kappa J'_\ell(\kappa a)$ is real if $\kappa \in I\!\!R$ or if κ is purely imaginary and ℓ is even. If ℓ is odd, $\kappa J'_\ell(\kappa a)$ is purely imaginary; since the same is true for $(\kappa/|\kappa|)^\ell$, we find in all cases $\delta_\ell(k) \approx -\frac{\pi}{2} + \arg H^{(1)}_\ell(ka)$, or

$$\delta_\ell(k) \,\approx\, \arctan \frac{J_\ell(ka)}{Y_\ell(ka)} \qquad (\mathrm{mod}\, \pi)\,. \tag{9}$$

The three–dimensional situation can be treated in a similar way. The radial solutions in the ℓ–th partial wave are now given by

$$f(r) \,=\, \left\{ \begin{array}{lll} c\, r\, j_\ell(\kappa r) & \dots & |r| < a \\ \\ r\left[j_\ell(kr) + ie^{i\delta_\ell} \sin\delta_\ell\, h^{(1)}_\ell(kr) \right] & \dots & |r| > a \end{array} \right. \tag{10}$$

with the same κ as above. In the hard–ball case the condition $f(a) = 0$ yields

$$\delta_\ell(k) \,=\, \arctan \frac{j_\ell(ka)}{y_\ell(ka)}\,. \tag{11}$$

At high energies we have $\delta_\ell(k) \approx -ka + \frac{\ell\pi}{2}$, while the low–energy asymptotics is

$$\delta_\ell(k) \,\approx\, -\,\frac{(ka)^{2\ell+1}}{(2\ell+1)((2\ell-1)!!)^2} \,+\, \mathcal{O}(k^{2\ell+3})\,.$$

In particular, the s–wave expression simplifies to the form

$$\delta_0(k) \,=\, -ka\,. \tag{12}$$

This has to be compared with the point–interaction phase–shift (2); they have the same low–energy behaviour if we put

$$\alpha \,=\, -\,\frac{1}{4\pi a}\,. \tag{13}$$

For a finite barrier/well (8) is replaced by

$$\delta_\ell(k) \,=\, \frac{\pi}{2} \,-\, \arg\left\{ \left[k\, j_\ell(\kappa a) h^{(1)\prime}_\ell(ka) - \kappa\, j'_\ell(\kappa a) h^{(1)}_\ell(ka) \right] \left(\frac{\kappa}{|\kappa|} \right)^\ell \right\}\,. \tag{14}$$

With the exception of the resonance case, $\kappa a \approx \frac{\pi}{2}\,(2n{+}\ell{+}1)$, the second term in the square bracket dominates for $|\kappa| a \gg 1 \gg ka$, and we have

$$\delta_\ell(k) \,\approx\, \arctan \frac{J_\ell(ka)}{Y_\ell(ka)} \qquad (\mathrm{mod}\, \pi)\,. \tag{15}$$

Concluding the argument, we have found that — with the exception of the resonance case — a square circular barrier/well in dimension two or three behaves under the condition $|\kappa|a \gg 1 \gg ka$ as a hard disc/ball *independently of the sign of* V_0, and consequently, that its low–energy scattering behaviour can be modeled by that of the corresponding point interaction with the coupling constant (4) or (13), respectively.

It is important that in both cases the value of the coupling constant depends only on the radius a of the interaction domain being independent of the potential strength V_0, provided $|V_0|a^2 \gg 1$. Moreover, the two–dimensional coupling constant is negative for $a < 1$. In dimension three, *a fortiori,* the identification (13) fixes the sign of the coupling constant for all a; a positive coupling constant can be achieved only in the resonance case. This means that when point interactions are used to model various physical situations with localized scatterers, negative coupling constants are the natural choice, while positive values have to be reserved for exceptional resonance states of the system.

In both cases the point interaction with the "correct" scattering properties has a bound state [1], however, the eigenvalue is well below the energy interval specified by the requirement $ka \ll 1$. Recall that a similar effect has been observed for the one–dimensional δ'–interaction [3] and its generalization to graphs [7] whose low–energy behaviour can be modeled by complicated geometric scatterers; it is more illustrative than the "true" approximation with a renormalized coupling constant and a non–local potential [14]. The coupling constant has in this case also a fixed sign and a transparent meaning as a summary length of the internal links of the scatterer.

Acknowledgement

The work has been partially supported by the Grant AS No.148409.

References

[1] S. Albeverio, F. Gesztesy, R. Høegh-Krohn, H. Holden: *Solvable Models in Quantum Mechanics*, Springer, Heidelberg 1988.

[2] J.–P. Antoine, P. Exner, P. Šeba, J. Shabani: A mathematical model of heavy–quarkonia decays, *Ann.Phys.* **233** (1994), 1–16.

[3] J.E.Avron, P.Exner, Y.Last: Periodic Schrödinger operators with large gaps and Wannier–Stark ladders, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **72** (1994), 896–899.

[4] F.A. Berezin, L.D. Faddeev: A remark on Schrödinger's equation with a singular potential, *Sov.Math.Doklady* **2** (1961), 372–375.

[5] S. Chaudhury, S. Bandyopadhyay, M. Cahay: Spatial distribution of current and Fermi carriers around localized elastic scatterers in quantum transport, *Phys.Rev.* **B45** (1992), 11126–11135.

[6] S. Chaudhury, S. Bandyopadhyay, M. Cahay: Current, potential, electric field, and Fermi carrier distributions around localized elastic scatterers in phase–coherent quantum magnetotransport, *Phys.Rev.* **B47** (1993), 12649–12662.

[7] P.Exner: Contact interactions on graph superlattices, *J.Phys.* **A29** (1996), 87–102.

[8] P. Exner, R. Gawlista, P. Šeba, M. Tater: Point interactions in a strip, *submitted for publication*

[9] A. Grossmann, R. Høegh–Krohn, M. Mebkhout: A class of explicitly soluble, local, many–center Hamiltonians for one–particle quantum mechanics in two and three dimensions, *J.Math.Phys.* **21** (1980), 2376–2385.

[10] G. Kirczenow *et al.*: Artificial impurities in quantum wires: from classical to quantum behavior, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **72** (1994), 2069–2072.

[11] I.V. Krive, S. Naftulin, A.S. Rozhavsky: Scattering by an ultralocal potential in a nontrivial topology, *Ann.Phys.* **232** (1994), 225–242.

[12] A. Mosk, Th.M. Niewenhuisen, C. Barnes: Theory of semiballistic wave propagation, *cond–mat/9601075*

[13] P. Rosenquist, N.D. Whelan, A. Wirzba: Small disks and semiclassical resonances, *chao–dyn/9602017*

[14] P. Šeba: Some remarks on the δ'–interaction in one dimension, *Rep.Math. Phys.* **24** (1986), 111–120.